DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 832 UD 014 070

TITLE	District Number 22 State Urban Education Projects.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	87p.; Function Number 75-2-6454-6457
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Bus Transportation; Educational Diagnosis; Individualized Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Program Evaluation; *Reading Diagnosis; Reading Difficulty; *Remedial Reading Programs; School Districts; Student Transportation; Teacher Aides; Teacher Educators; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates four New York City school district educational projects funded by the "New York State Urban Education Program". The Diagnostic and Remedial Reading Center provides intensive instruction in reading to approximately 40 to 45 children during the academic year. The center is staffed by a reading specialist, a part-time psychologist and two educational assistants. Morning sessions are held for children throughout the district who are bussed to the center and afternoon sessions for children in the neighboring school. Children attend the center for a period of a semester. Upon the recognition by the Advisory Council of the need for in-service training for new and inexperienced teachers, the Teaching Training for New and Inexperienced Teachers Program came into being. As it is constituted, three teacher trainers have been assigned to two or three schools each, depending upon the need. Three teacher trainers have been assigned to two or three schools each, depending upon the need. An appraisal of junior high school reading achievement indicated that many of these students were reading far below grade level. It was decided to institute a special reading program for them. The program selected consists basically of controlled readers supplemented by workbooks. The J. H. S. Reading Laboratories program was instituted in February, 1971. The Educational Assistants to Aid Underachievers program was instituted in 10 elementary schools with a staff of 20 educational assistants assigned to them, according to need. The assistants are used for early identification and remediation of first graders with reading problems. (Author/JM)

ED 087832

DISTRICT #22

STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROJECTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the "New York State Urban Education Program" enacted at the 1970 Legislative session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty" (Education Law 3602, Subdivision II as amended), performed under a contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1971-1972 school year.

Evaluation Director
Professor Herbert London

Evaluation Coordinator
Professor Irene Shigaki

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

UD 014670

August, 1972

New York University

School of Education
Center for Educational Research and Field Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 Press Building
Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003
Telephone: (212) 598-2898, 3425

September 30, 1972

Dr. David Abramson
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Abramson:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated December 7, 1971 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Educational Research and Field Services, I am pleased to submit three hundred copies of the final report, District #22, State Urban Education, 1971-1972.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under State Urban Education, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:jh

PREFACE

This evaluation comprises an effort by a carefully selected New York University team to assess the State Urban program in District 22. Commencing in October 1971 this evaluation team proceeded to administer various tests, conduct numerous observations and intensive interviews, compute and analyze scores, develop and disseminate instruments and examine results and consequently evolve recommendations. The entire process lasted only ten months before the report was completed - a fact that undoubtedly makes this assessment somewhat tentative. Nonetheless the careful scrutiny given each project and the concern for honest appraisal demonstrated by the team make this report a valuable guide for future State Urban planning.

As director I deeply appreciate the assistance offered by my colleagues, the research assistants and the secretary whose labors often went beyond the call of duty. Additionally, I wish to extend my gratitude to the District 22 State Urban administration for the assistance it provided in completing this report. Tasks of this kind are often inhibited by personal pique, community politics and mandated constraints - factors which are present in District 22 - nonetheless this final report transcends these issues to an extraordinary degree and comes to grips with the ostensible concerns of State Urban programs. This is undeniably a tribute to the evaluation team.

Herbert London
July, 1972

DISTRICT #22

NEW YORK STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIAL READING CENTER

Final Evaluation Report

June, 1972

Irene S. Shigaki

New York University

Background

Realizing the need for remedial reading services for children with severe reading disabilities, an exploration of feasible programs was made by the District #22 Superintendent, Dr. Jaffe. The Diagnostic and Remedial Reading Center resulted from this exploration. In its second year of operation, the center is staffed by a reading specialist, a part-time psychologist and two educational assistants. The center provides intensive instruction in reading to approximately 40 to 45 children during the academic year. Morning sessions are held for children throughout the district who are bussed to the center and afternoon sessions for children in the neighboring school, P.S. 269. Each session runs for approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes. Children attend the center for a period of a semester. In addition, there is an after-school program meeting several afternoons a week primarily for the benefit of students who have been previously enrolled. Help in maintaining and extending skills is provided.

The center operates on a budget of $45,563 for the 1971-1972 academic year which is allocated in the following manner:

Pedagogic personnel	$16,875
Nonpedagogic personnel (Educational Assistants)	10,337
Psychologist (part-time)	7,026
Employee benefits	4,108
Equipment	755
Supplies	2,199
Evaluation	2,067
Parent Involvement	25
5% Overhead	2,171
TOTAL	$ 45,563

The objective for this project was as follows:

1. As a result of the program, 50% of those students identified as needing remediation will be diagnosed and given tutorial assistance which will lead to a gain of at least five months on the Spache and Slosson reading tests.

For purposes of evaluation, observations were made at the Center, and interviews were conducted with the reading specialist, the psychologist and the two educational assistants. Pre- and post-test scores for the Slosson Oral Reading Test and the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scale were analyzed. Relevant background information of the children attending the Center was also collected with the intent of computing correlations with reading achievement to see if any significant relationships are present. Questionnaires for this purpose were distributed to the classroom teachers. Due to incomplete returns and the resulting small sample size, the correlations computed were not meaningful. Consequently, the results are not included in this report.

Observations and Interviews

Students for the Diagnostic and Remedial Reading Center suffer from severe retardation in reading and require remediation not available in individual schools. A careful and extensive screening and diagnostic procedure facilitates the selection and provides information concerning an appropriate form of remediation. Among the battery of tests which are administered are the following.

1. The Slosson Oral Reading Test
2. The Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales
3. The Harris Test of Lateral Dominance
4. A test of alphabet recognition followed by a phonics inventory
5. Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination
6. Visual Memory of Words Section from the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty
7. The Auditory Sequential Memory Section of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities
8. The Frostig Test of Visual Perception
9. The Slosson Drawing Coordination Test

In addition, the psychologist on the staff of the Center tests each child who is referred on the WISC, the Bender-Gestalt and the Goodenough Draw-A-Man Test.

The laboratory itself is well equipped with a variety of workbooks and equipment. The approach emphasized is primarily an analytical phonetic one, but is amply supplemented with materials utilizing other approaches. The pupil-teacher ratio is a highly favorable one of 4:1 and at times even lower when the psychologist is at the center and with the periodic assistance of student teachers. The resources as well as the personnel are utilized flexibly. Children work in small groups or individually, sometimes with

an adult at other times independently through programmed materials. The pace and materials for individual children are adapted to their learning rate, their areas of deficiency and their attention span. During any given session a variety of experiences are provided for each child.

The esprit de corps of the staff is extremely high as they are capably led by the reading specialist. The addition of a part-time psychologist who works at the center one day a week has also been an asset particularly in helping the two able educational assistants understand some of the dynamics of the behavior of the children. The staff plans together on a daily basis, discussing the progress of individual children, planning future lessons, and selecting appropriate materials. The experience at the center has stimulated an interest in the assistants to pursue further work in corrective reading. The staff is enthusiastic about the program. They realize that the number of children that they service is small, but feel that the program could not be as effective if it were operated on a mass basis. Since the clientele are children with severe reading retardation with a history of failure in reading, the individual attention which is possible is seen as crucial to the success of the program.

The psychologist, who is available three days a week, spends two of her days in the schools of the District testing individual children with her battery of tests. Typically she is able to screen two children a day. The procedure includes a review of all available records on the child, observation of the child in his classroom setting, and administration of the battery of tests. One day a week she is available at the center. During this time she generally sees four children on an individual basis for a twenty minute counseling session which is continued on a weekly basis.

A variety of reasons were cited for the selection of particular children for counseling. Included among them were children with perceptual difficulties, faulty early education, aggressive behavior, and emotional problems. A counseling session characteristically might include a discussion of areas such as leisure-time activities and school problems, picture drawing followed by a discussion on the content, and testing and training in an area such as perception. The psychologist occasionally follows-up with a phone call to the home. Observations of these sessions left the impression that substantive influences were minimal primarily due to the fleeting nature of these contacts--only twenty minutes once a week.

An area of concern expressed by the staff through the interviews was the insufficiency of follow-up to the work at the Center, because of lack of staff. A written report is submitted to the principal and classroom teacher of each child completing work at the Center, including recommendations concerning appropriate follow-up work for that child. When possible and necessary, arrangements have been made to have a child continue in a tutorial situation with an educational assistant in his school. Additional follow-up would include supervision of these educational assistants as well as tutorial work for those who no longer require the intensive work at the Center, but need additional support in addition to the classroom.

Reading Scores

In order to determine the effect of the program as compared to traditional reading instruction, a comparison was made between the anticipated post-test score, based on each student's previous growth rate in reading and the actual post-test score. Two sets of scores were available for this analysis, scores on the Slosson Oral Reading Test and the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scale. The Bond and Singer method employed for this

computation is computed as follows:

1. Obtain each pupil's pre-test grade equivalent score.
2. Divide the pre-test score by the number of months the pupil has been in school to obtain a hypothetical rate of growth.
3. Multiply the predicted number of months of exposure to the program by the hypothetical rate of growth. (Since the program was a semester in duration, it was computed at .4 year to allow for periods when instruction was not given, i.e., vacations, testing periods, etc.).
4. Add No. 1 and No. 3 for the anticipated post-test or predicted score.
5. Test the difference for significance between the predicted post-test and obtained post-test scores with a t-test.

The results of this analysis for the Slosson was not significant ($t=.96$, $df=40$, see Table I). It should be made clear that the children did make gains and these gains were greater than the anticipated one based on growth rate. The difference between anticipated and actual post-test scores, however, were not significant. The analysis on the Spache was computed with a sample of 14 subjects since these were the only students with a measurable score on this instrument. The t-test resulted in a significant difference between the anticipated post-test and actual post-test scores ($t=5.13$, $df=13$, $p<.001$, see Table II).

Scores were also tabulated to indicate the cumulative percentage of gains in scores between the pre-test and the post-test (see Table III). It can be seen from this table that more than 50% of the students enrolled in the Diagnostic and Remedial Reading Center attained the criterion level of at least a five-month gain. The cumulative percentage of individuals showing at least a five-month gain of the Slosson was 58.5% and on the

Spache 85.7%. This gain is even more striking when one considers that the treatment period was only five months and that children with such severe reading retardation rarely show a gain in reading equivalent to the length of exposure to a program. Table IV indicates scores on the pre-test and post-test on the Spache. On the pre-test, only 14 children were reading well enough to be measured by this instrument, the rest of the children scoring below the floor of the test. By the post-test, 34 of the 41 students enrolled in the program attained a measurable score on the instrument. Despite the non-significant t-value on the Slosson, there is evidence that the children are making progress in reading, beyond the criterion level.

Summary and Recommendations

Observations and interviews with the staff of the program have indicated that it is an efficiently and smoothly running program. Analysis of the achievement scores of the students served by the program show impressive gains well beyond the criterion level initially set for the program, though the difference between anticipated and actual post-test scores on the Slosson was not significant. The difference between the anticipated and actual post-test scores on the Spache, however, were highly significant. It cannot be stated too strongly that the gains made by the children are undoubtedly attributable to the competent staff, the adequate resources and the favorable teacher-pupil ratio. There is a danger when programs such as this exhibit success that in subsequent years their effect is diluted through attempts at spreading its influence thinly across a larger population. The careful diagnosis and individualization is not feasible on a mass basis given these facilities. It is highly recommended that this program be re-cycled.

The chief recommendation for changes concerns the role of the psychologist.

It is recommended that a full-time psychologist with background in reading be included on the staff. The additional two days can be allocated in the following manner:

1. The counseling sessions that the psychologist held with individual children appeared to be of limited value due to the insufficiency of the contact. Therefore, it is recommended that the psychologist spend two days at the center counseling children on a twice a week basis.
2. If a psychologist with a strong background in reading disabilities is hired she can be made available one day a week to provide further follow-up to graduates of the Center.

Table I

A Comparison of Slosson Oral Reading Test Scores for Anticipated Post-Test and Actual Post-Test Scores

Scores	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean	t
Anticipated post-test	41	.11	1.1	.96*
Actual post-test	41	.20	1.6	

*Not significant

Table II

A Comparison of Spache Diagnostic Reading Scale Scores for Anticipated Post-Test and Actual Post-Test Scores

Scores	Number	Standard Deviation	Mean	t
Anticipated post-test	14	.14	2.0	5.13*
Actual post-test	14	.29	[redacted]	

*Significant beyond the .001 level.

Table III

Distribution of Differences Between Pre-Test and Post-Test Spache and Slosson Scores

	Slosson			Spache		
Gains	No.	%	Cum.%	No.	%	Cum. %
.1 to .2	5	12.3	100.0	2	14.3	100.0
.3 to .4	12	29.2	87.7			
.5 to .6	11	26.8	58 5	4	28.7	85.7
.7 to .8	1	2.5	31.7	5	35.7	57.0
.9 to 1.0	5	12.3	29.2	1	7.1	21.3
1.1 to 1.2	4	9.6	16.9	1	7.1	14.2
1.3 to 1.4	2	4.8	7.3			
1.5 to 1.6				1	7.1	7.1
1.7 to 1.8						
1.9 to 2.0	1	2.5	2.5			
TOTALS	41			14		

Table IV

Distribution of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores
on the Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	No.	%	Cum. %	No.	%	Cum. %
1.6 to 1.7	7	50.0	100.0	10	29.4	100.0
1.8 to 1.9	5	35.7	50.0	7	20.6	70.6
2.0 to 2.1				2	5.8	50.0
2.2 to 2.3	2	14.3	14.3	9	26.5	44.2
2.4 to 2.5						
2.6 to 2.7						
2.8 to 2.9				4	11.9	17.7
3.0 to 3.1				1	2.9	5.8
3.2 to 3.3				1	2.9	2.9
TOTALS	14			34		

DISTRICT #22

NEW YORK STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

TEACHER TRAINING FOR NEW AND INEXPERIENCED TEACHERS

Final Evaluation Report

June, 1972

Irene S. Shigaki

New York University

Background

Upon the recognition by the Advisory Council of the need for in-service training for new and inexperienced teachers, the Teaching Training for New and Inexperienced Teachers Program came into being in the middle of the 1970-1971 academic year. The 1971-1972 academic school year was the first full year of operation of the program. As it is constituted, three teacher trainers have been assigned to two or three schools each, depending upon the need. The three trainers were selected by the Deputy Superintendent and State Urban Coordinator from applicants who had been teaching in the schools of the district.

The operating budget for this program is allocated primarily to the salaries of these trainers and is as follows:

Pedagogic personnel	$ 47,825
Employee benefits	8,184
Evaluation	2,801
5% Overhead	2,941
TOTAL	$ 61,751

Two objectives were established for the program. They were:

1. As a result of participation in the program, 75% of the students affected by these teachers will make a significant gain in reading and math as measured in district and classroom test scores.
2. Teachers will demonstrate a familiarity with those techniques discussed in the training session so that they will consider their own teaching skills, lesson plans and class management improved.

Data Collection

A variety of sources of information concerning the program were collected to provide a breadth of points of view. Early in the school year the teacher trainers were asked to respond to a questionnaire. This was followed up by an interview in February. Two principals with teacher trainers who were among the sample schools for evaluation of the State Urban Programs were interviewed and asked to assess the effectiveness of the program. Each teacher trainer kept a log of her activities for the program which were submitted in duplicate, one copy to the principal of the school where she worked and one copy to the Coordinator of the State Urban Programs. A sample of these logs were examined as part of the job analysis to determine the manner in which the trainers allocated their time while in the schools. The State Urban Coordinator completed a questionnaire which included questions on the origins of the program, objectives, budget and effectiveness. A sample of classroom teachers who had received help from a trainer were surveyed and asked to give their impressions as well as to assess their professional growth resulting from the assistance they had received. Each of the teacher trainers was

observed on the job to ascertain how a typical day might be spent. Finally, a sample of scores in reading and mathematics of pupils in classes where teachers received training were gathered and examined.

Observations, Questionnaires and Interviews

As might be expected, much of the information collected were complementary in nature. Responses from the principals, and trainers, observations, and examination of the logs will be summarized together in this section. Both the principals and teacher trainers spoke positively about the program. Typically a teacher trainer checked with the principal to determine who needed assistance, reporting back on the progress made. All trainers reported complete support from the administrators both in encouragement and the availability of materials through which to implement their work.

Among the kinds of services that the teacher trainer provided were demonstration lessons in a variety of subject matter areas, help in the acquisition of materials for use in the classroom and assistance in classroom planning and management. The teachers who received their assistance could be divided into two rough categories, those who received extended support with contacts on a once a week basis or more often and those who received support or help in a specific area with a limited number of contacts. Since the trainers were fellow teachers and not supervisors, they found it best not to impose their services and chose instead, to gradually build up a feeling of trust whereby the teacher would feel free to come to consult them. One teacher trainer had been assigned to the school where she had formerly taught. Often the trainers checked with the teachers to see if they needed help and to let them know that they were available. The extent of contact and help offered

could not help but depend upon the receptivity of the teachers. It was felt, however, that this arrangement was preferable to that of a supervisory role since the teachers may feel even more reluctant to seek help if they perceived that their work was simultaneously being evaluated. It was also felt that the program was more successful during the 1971-1972 program primarily because better relationships had been established. Depending on the number of days the trainer was in the building, she might work with ten to twenty teachers on an intensive basis with contacts with an additional, usually smaller, group on an on-call basis.

The three teacher trainers met as a group about once a week. Each had her unique strengths. The range of teaching experience among the three was approximately six to twenty-five years. During that time each had accumulated her own file of resources which were shared among them, resulting in a storehouse of practical ideas which were available to the teachers with whom they worked.

Several suggestions for improvement of the program were made. The teacher trainers and principals felt that there should be assignment to fewer schools so that contact with each school could be more intensive. Two of the three trainers felt it would be beneficial to have training sessions with other teacher trainers from the New York Public Schools to share ideas. They also felt that workshops conducted by experts in the various curriculum areas would be beneficial. The State Urban Coordinator suggested that the trainers be selected for expertise in a given area. Finally, it was suggested that more group work with teachers be instituted to minimize duplication such as in demonstration lessons.

Classroom Teacher Interviews

Since the trainers worked with a group of teachers on a continuing basis and another group on a less intensive basis, it was felt that the

two groups might have differing perceptions of the program. Therefore, representatives of both groups were included in the sample interviewed. Eleven teachers were interviewed altogether. Upon inspection of the responses from the two groups it was found that little or no differences existed between them concerning their assessment of the program. From interviews with the trainers as well as the logs it was possible to identify some of their key areas of responsibility. A list of these areas was made available to the teachers interviewed with the instruction to assess their own growth in the areas where they had received assistance. The responses are tabulated in Table I. Many teachers reported some improvement with most reporting much improvement, the highest rating on the scale. No improvement was reported only by two individuals in two areas. These teachers, however, reported growth in other areas. It can be concluded then based on the teachers self-perception of growth, and the positive assessment of the principals that the second objective of the program was satisfactorily met. The teachers were also asked to assess the effectiveness of the teacher trainers. Their responses are tabulated in Table II. Again, most of the teachers rated the trainers high (5 on a 5-point scale) with some ratings which were average. In rating the over-all effectiveness of the program, nine of the eleven were enthusiastic, one was positive, and one was slightly positive. The most frequent comments made remarked on the supportiveness and dedication of the trainers and the need to have one in the school at all times.

Reading and Math Scores

It is an unfortunate reality of the funding procedure of State Urban Programs that one of the requirements is the statement of objectives in some behavioral form, which is usually interpreted as results on a

standardized test. In this project, the behavioral objective took the form of significant increases in reading and mathematics by 75% of the students in classes where teachers received assistance. At best this is an indirect measure of the effectiveness of this program. It was compounded by the fact that the extent of the assistance varied considerably. Further, no consideration was made of the growth rate of the children involved. Finally, it was not possible to proctor or administer the tests by the evaluation staff, introducing the possibility of unreliable scores.

In an attempt at minimizing the variation in assistance received, only those teachers who had received continual help formed the population from which a sample was drawn. This population was further constricted due to the following considerations. It was found that in some of the classes a team-teaching arrangement was in operation, these teachers were eliminated from the population. Likewise, teachers of 1st grade classes were eliminited since pre-test scores would not be available. It was also found that by June much of the records for those students going to junior high had been transferred to the new school. In most cases there were incomplete records. With all of these restrictions, only a limited sample of classroom performance measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test could be obtained. Reading scores for 1972 were obtained for two second grade classes. Pre- and post-test scores in reading (1971 and 1972) were obtained in reading for two fourth grade classes. Scores in reading and math for 1972 were obtained for one fifth grade class. The distribution of these scores are tabulated in Tables III, IV, and V. As these tests were administered in late April or May of 1972, the approximate grade norms would be 2.8 for the

second grade, 4.8 for the fourth grade, and 5.8 for the fifth grade. Norms should be interpreted to indicate that point at which 50% of the norming population scored above and 50% scored below. Differences in pre- and post-test scores were computed for the fourth grade sample and are tabulated in Table VI. It appears that the pre-test scores were inflated, depressing the gain scores, hence casting doubt on the validity of this data.

The available MAT scores are tabled and reported here to meet the requirements of the evaluation. It is this evaluator's strong feeling that they do not give meaningful information for the evaluation of this program due to the indirectness of the measure and the possibility of unreliability of the scores.

Summary and Recommendations

Information gathered through observations, interviews, and questionnaires attest to the value of the program and the effectiveness of the three trainers. It is, therefore, recommended that the program be continued.

Suggestions for the program and its subsequent evaluation are as follows:

1. Reliance on performance on the MAT without sufficient controls is a dubious practice which may lead to distortion of actual program contributions. If such scores must be used, adequate controls should be made for the reliability of the results through allocating enough evaluation funds for the proctoring, or administration of such instruments. It is suggested that

comparison of growth in classes matched for teacher experience and pupil ability where one group receives assistance and the other does not may provide more meaningful information.

2. Workshop sessions for the trainers with experts in various content areas held on a city-wide basis would be of value in keeping the trainers abreast of current educational theories and practices.

3. The encouragement of group sessions with the trainers by each building principal would minimize duplication and may lead to greater contact and receptivity on the part of the teachers. This does not preclude the need for much individual assistance. Ideally, group sessions should be arranged with provisions for released teacher time and on a voluntary basis.

TABLE I

Self Evaluation of Teachers Assisted
By Teacher Trainers[1]

Area	Regressed 1	No Improvement 2	Some Improvement 3	Much Improvement 4
Subject Matter Areas:				
Reading			3	5
Math		1	1	5
Language Arts		1	1	4
Social Studies			2	2
Penmanship			1	2
Choral Speaking				1
Creative Wtiting				1
Discipline			3	1
Evaluation of Activities			1	3
Acquisition of Materials			6	4
Preparation of Materials			1	5
Classroom Planning			1	3
Establishing Routines				5

[1]There were a total of eleven respondents. Responses were made only to appropriate categories.

TABLE II

Ratings of the Effectiveness of the Teacher Trainer[1]

Area	Low 1	2	Average 3	4	High 5
Availability of materials and resources			2	3	6
Accessibility			3		7
Skill in holding conferences and working with others			2		8
Demonstration lessons			3		5
Knowledge of subject matter areas			1	1	9
General knowledge of education				1	10

[1]There were a total of eleven respondents. Not all responded to each item.

TABLE III

Distribution of 1972 Metropolitan Achievement Scores In Reading For A Second Grade Sample

Grade Equivalents	No.	%	Cum. %
1.5 to 1.6	4	8.0	100.0
1.7 to 1.8	2	4.0	92.0
1.9 to 2.0	5	10.0	88.0
2.1 to 2.2	4	8.0	78.0
2.3 to 2.4	7	14.0	70.0
2.5 to 2.6	11	24.0	56.0
2.7 to 2.8	4	8.0	32.0
2.9 to 3.0	2	4.0	24.0
3.1 to 3.2	5	10.0	20.0
3.3 to 2.4	1	2.0	10.0
3.5 to 3.6	4	8.0	8.0
TOTAL	49		

TABLE IV

Distribution of 1972 Metropolitan Achievement Scores
In Reading For A Fourth Grade Sample

Grade Equivalents	No.	%	Cum. %
3.0 to 3.4	1	2.0	100.0
3.5 to 3.9	5	10.5	98.0
4.0 to 4.4	4	8.5	87.5
4.5 to 4.9	5	10.5	79.0
5.0 to 5.4	9	19.5	68.5
5.5 to 5.9	9	19.5	49.0
6.0 to 6.4	4	8.5	29.5
6.5 to 6.9	4	8.5	21.0
7.0 to 7.4			
7.5 to 7.9			
8.0 to 8.4	5	10.5	12.5
8.5 to 8.9			
9.0 to 9.4			
9.5 to 9.9			
10.0 to 10.4			
10.5 to 10.9	1	2.0	2.0
TOTAL	47		

TABLE V

Distribution of 1972 Metropolitan Achievement Scores
In Reading and Mathematics For A Fifth Grade Sample

Grade Equivalents	Reading			Mathematics		
	No.	%	Cum. %	No.	%	Cum. %
3.0 to 3.4				1	3.5	100.0
3.5 to 3.9	1	3.0	100.0			
4.0 to 4.4						
4.5 to 4.9	1	3.0	97.0	2	6.5	96.5
5.0 to 5.4	2	6.5	94.0	1	3.5	90.0
5.5 to 5.9	3	9.5	87.5			
6.0 to 6.4	2	6.5	78.0	3	9.5	86.5
6.5 to 6.9	2	6.5	71.5	6	19.5	77.0
7.0 to 7.4	6	19.5	65.0	3	9.5	57.5
7.5 to 7.9	5	15.5	46.5	2	6.5	48.0
8.0 to 8.4	4	12.5	31.0	5	15.5	41.5
8.5 to 8.9	1	3.0	18.5	3	9.5	26.0
9.0 to 9.4	1	3.0	15.5			
9.5 to 9.9				1	3.5	16.5
10.0 to 10.4				3	9.5	13.0
10.5 to 10.9	2	6.5	12.5	1	3.5	3.5
11.0 to 11.4	1	3.0	6.0			
11.5 to 11.0						
12.0 to 12.4	1	3.0	3.0			
TOTALS	32			32		

TABLE VI

Distribution of Differences Between 1971 and 1972
Metropolitan Achievement Scores in Reading
For The Fourth Grade Sample

Gains or Losses	No.	%	Cum. %
-2.6 to -3.0	1	2.6	100.0
-2.1 to -2.5			
-1.6 to -2.0			
-1.1 to -1.5			
- .6 to -1.0	1	2.6	97.4
- .1 to - .5	2	5.2	94.8
0	6	15.4	89.6
.1 to .5	8	20.5	74.2
.6 to 1.0	11	28.1	53.7
1.1 to 1.5	7	17.9	25.6
1.6 to 2.0	3	7.7	7.7
TOTAL	39		

DISTRICT #22

NEW YORK STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

J. H. S. READING LABORATORIES

Final Evaluation Report

June, 1972

Irene S. Shigaki

New York University

Background

An appraisal of the junior high school reading scores as measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test, indicated that many of these students were reading far below grade level. It was decided to institute a special reading program for them. The program selected is put out by the Educational Developmental Laboratory consisting basically of controlled readers supplemented by workbooks. The program was instituted in J.H.S. 240 in February, 1971 and was expanded to include J.H.S. 14 in the fall of 1971. As the equipment did not arrive on time, it was not until November, 1971 that the reading laboratory was in operation in J.H.S. 14.

The program operated on a total budget of $89,957 during the 1971-1972 academic year. These monies were allocated in the following manner:

Pedagogic personnel	$ 36,834
Nonpedogogic personnel (Educational Assistants)	21,338
Employee benefits	8,249
Equipment	3,792
Supplies	11,380
Evaluation	4,080
5% overhead	4,284
TOTAL	$ 89,957

The project objective was as follows:

1. As a result of the program, 60% of the participating pupils will raise their reading level by at least six months on the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Through interviews with the staffs of the reading centers in the two junior high schools it was discovered that not all students would attend the reading laboratory for the entire academic year. In J.H.S. 14 the program was a semester in duration, resulting in a larger group of students benefitting from the facilities of the laboratory. In J.H.S. 240 the length of the program was determined on an individual basis, some students for a semester, others for a full year if deemed to be beneficial. Due to this variation in length of exposure to the program it was necessary to revise the objective. In response to the original proposal submitted, it was suggested that the Bond and Singer method be employed whereby an anticipated post-test score based on each child's previous growth rate would be compared with the actual post-test score in reading. This method utilizes each pupil as his own control and was the method employed in the analysis of the test results. Further details are given below under the heading Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading Scores.

Data Collection

Three sources of information were utilized for purposes of this evaluation. First, observations were made in the reading laboratories of both junior high schools. Second, interviews were conducted with an adminstrator in each building, the two reading teachers and the four educational assistants. Finally, pre- and post-test scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test in reading were made available for all the students in the program by the

teachers in charge. An attempt was also made to acquire information concerning the background of the students in the program so that correlations could be computed between background variables and achievement in reading. Due to the insufficiency of responses to the questionnaires which were deciminated, it was not possible to conduct this analysis.

Observations and Interviews

Both reading laboratories were furnished in a similar manner. The equipment included a Controlled Reader, four Junior Controlled Readers for individual use, two Aud-Xs, a Tach-X and a tape recorder. These equipment utilized primarily a visual approach to reading focussing on such skills as scanning and the development of phonics generalizations. The machines were supplemented by coordinated workbooks checking comprehension usually on a factual level, vocabulary including work with contextual clues and spelling.

The logistics in the two schools varied slightly. In J.H.S. 14 children were assigned to the reading laboratory for a double-period running for 80 minutes. Approximately 24 children were in each group with approximately 70 served each semester. The children spent the first 40 minutes working with the machines and the second period working on reading skills with the use of workbooks. In J.H.S. 240 approximately 15 students were in each group and participated for 40 minutes daily. With five periods in a day, again around 70 to 75 children were aided each term. During the work period with the machines the children generally worked in three groups, each on a different machine, supervised either by the reading teacher or one of the assistants.

The two teachers heading the staffs in the reading center of the two schools were chosen by the principals of each school based on background experience teaching reading. Of the four educational assistants,

three hold baccalaureate degrees while the fourth will complete her work for the B.A. in June, 1972.

Through interviews it was learned that the staffs felt positively about the program as they perceived that the students were benefitting considerably. All felt that the program should be continued. Several suggestions were made, however. The staff at J.H.S. 240 commented on the training sessions which all attended at the beginning of the school year. The sessions which ran for three days were conducted by representatives from Educational Developmental Laboratory, publishers of the reading program used. The feeling was that the format, which consisted primarily of lectures, would have benefitted from actual participation and work with the machines used in the program. The staff also voiced a need for additional screening of students in the program including psychological testing, diagnostic reading and a physical examination particularly to detect hearing impairments. Need for a larger room and/or fewer students at one time was also cited.

The concerns of the staff of J.H.S. 14 differed somewhat. The materials were not felt to be appropriate in all cases, some being too long or too slow moving to maintain the interest of the students. There was also a request for more Junior Controlled Readers to help further individualize the program. Concern was expressed for the fact that all students who would benefit from the program could not be accommodated with the existing facilities. The staff at J.H.S. 14 had added a voluntary after-school session available twice a week for any student who was interested in attending the laboratory. Twenty-four more students were being helped in this manner, though some of the students who attended participated in the program during the day as well.

General comments about the program included the initial motivating

impetus provided by the machinery. At J.H.S. 240 where the program has been in effect longer, it was reported however, that after a few months the novelty of the machines had worn off. Frequent breakdowns of machinery and long waiting periods for repairs, despite the ingenuity of the staff in some of the repair work, further hindered the program.

Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading Scores

In order to determine the effect of the program as compared to traditional reading instruction, a comparison was made between the anticipated post-test score, based on each student's previous growth rate in reading and the actual post-test score. The Bond and Singer method employed for this computation is computed as follows:

1. Obtain each pupil's pre-test grade equivalent score.
2. Divide the pre-test score by the number of months the pupil has been in school to obtain a hypothetical rate of growth.
3. Multiply the predicted number of months of exposure to the program by the hypothetical rate of growth. (Programs of a semester's duration were computed at .4 year and full year programs .8 year to allow for periods when instruction was not given, i.e., vacations, testing periods, etc.)
4. Add No. 1 and No. 3 for the anticipated post-test or predicted score.
5. Test the difference for significance between predicted post-test and obtained post-test scores with a t-test.

Following this procedure, a t-test was computed between the predicted post-test score and the actual post-test scores to determine if the program

resulted in greater growth than would be expected on the basis of the student's past record. The t-test yielded significant results for J.H.S. 14 ($t=8.59$, $df=119$, $p<.001$) and for J.H.S. 240 ($t=3.09$, $df=113$, $p<.01$) indicating that the program did in fact make a difference (see Table I and II).

Cumulative percentages of differences between the pre- and post-test scores are listed in Tables III and IV. It can be seen in Table III that at J.H.S. 14 though the program was only a one semester one, 78.4% of the children in the fall and 66.8% of the children in the spring attained growths of from .5 to .6 of a year meeting the criterion level. At J.H.S. 240 67.9% of the full year students, 73.9% of the fall and 40.8% of the spring students made gains of from .5 to .6 of a year. Therefore, at J.H.S. 240, students in the full year and fall programs met the criterion level for assessing the program; while the criterion level was not attained by the spring group.

The difference in growth between the spring group and the other two groups was a surprising finding. It may be the result of a selection factor. Those students most in need of the reading program may have been selected first to enter either the full or full year programs, with those showing less retardation included in the spring. It was not possible to explore reasons for the difference since the school year had ended by the time the scores were received and analyzed.

It should be pointed out that since a group of students were exposed to a full year program one would expect them to have made greater gains in reading than those exposed to only a semester's program. This was not the case. The comments of the staff of J.H.S. 240 are of relevance here.

As reported earlier, they had asked for more careful screening of the students for the program. Such screening may be helpful in identifying those students who would benefit most from such a program. In J.H.S. 240 a number of students either failed to make any gains in reading or performed worse on the post-test than on the pre-test. The reasons most often cited on the reading program report were emotional problems poor work habits, and immature behavior. Sufficient screening would help to minimize the inclusion of such students.

Summary and Recommendations

The significant difference between anticipated and actual post-test scores attest to the success of the Junior High School Reading Laboratories. It is recommended that the program be continued with the following modifications:

1. Careful screening of students should be instituted to insure the selection of those children who would most benefit from the program. Such screening should include both psychological and physical factors.
2. It is questionable whether the growth of those students exposed to a full year of treatment is sufficient to continue them for this length of time. It appears that the motivational stimulus provided by the machinery peaks and declines after a few months.
3. With the frequent machinery breakdowns and limited effectiveness of such equipment, it would probably not be wise to invest further in this hardware. Rather, available machinery can be incorporated into a program devoted to meeting individual reading needs, thus better utilizing the resource of three adults in the classroom. For example, much of the work with the Aud-X can be done by the students with

minimal supervision. Personnel might be better used to work with students in areas not easily communicated through programmed instruction. Little was done in the area of comprehension beyond the factual level. Critical reading skill should be an important fact of any reading program, particularly on the junior high school level.

4. Training from publishers of reading programs are generally specific to the program and may therefore have limited value to a comprehensive understanding of the reading process. Staff training might instead be devoted to establishing diagnostic procedures and individualizing the program for the needs of each student.

TABLE I

A Comparison of Metropolitan Achievement Scores in Reading for Anticipated Post-Test and Actual Post-Test Scores at J.H.S. 14

Scores	Number	Mean	t
Anticipated Post-test	120	4.5	
			8.59*
Actual Post-test	120	5.1	

*Significant beyond the .001 level.

TABLE II

A Comparison of Metropolitan Achievement Scores in Reading for Anticipated Post-Test and Actual Post-Test Scores at J.H.S. 240

Scores	Number	Mean	t
Anticipated Post-test	114	5.2	
			3.09*
Actual Post-test	114	5.5	

*Significant beyond the .01 level.

TABLE III

Distribution of Differences Between Pre- and Post-Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores in Reading for the Fall and Spring Programs at J.H.S. 14

Gains or Losses	Fall Term			Spring Term		
	No.	%	Cum %	No.	%	Cum %
-1.7 to -1.8						
-1.5 to -1.6						
-1.3 to -1.4						
-1.1 to -1.2						
- .9 to -1.0						
- .7 to - .8						
- .5 to - .6						
- .3 to - .4				1	1.7	100.0
- .1 to - .2				3	5.0	98.3
0	2	3.3	100.0	5	8.2	93.3
.1 to .2	4	6.7	96.7	7	11.6	85.1
.3 to .4	7	11.6	90.0	4	6.7	73.5
.5 to .6	12	20.0	78.4	8	13.3	66.8
.7 to .8	5	8.2	58.4	6	10.0	53.5
.9 to 1.0	10	16.8	50.2	7	11.6	43.5
1.1 to 1.2	8	13.3	33.4	4	6.7	31.9
1.3 to 1.4	2	3.3	20.1	4	6.7	25.2
1.5 to 1.6				4	6.7	18.5
1.7 to 1.8	1	1.7	16.8	1	1.7	11.8
1.9 to 2.0	2	3.3	15.1	2	3.3	10.1
2.1 to 2.2	1	1.7	11.8	1	1.7	6.8
2.3 to 2.4	3	5.0	10.1	1	1.7	5.1
2.5 to 2.6	1	1.7	5.1			
2.7 to 2.8						
2.9 to 3.0	1	1.7	3.4	1	1.7	3.4
3.1 to 3.2						
3.3 to 3.4	1	1.7	1.7			
3.7 to 3.8				1	1.7	1.7
TOTAL	60			60		

TABLE IV

Distribution of Differences Between Pre- and Post-Test Metropolitan Achievement Scores in Reading for the Full Year, Fall, and Spring Programs at J.H.S. 240

Gains or Losses	Full Year			Fall Term			Spring Term		
	No.	%	Cum %	No.	%	Cum %	No.	%	Cum %
-1.7 to -1.8							1	3.1	100.0
-1.5 to -1.6									
-1.3 to -1.4									
-1.1 to -1.2							1	3.1	96.9
- .9 to -1.0							1	3.1	93.8
- .7 to - .8	1	1.7	100.0				3	9.5	90.7
- .5 to - .6	1	1.7	98.3				2	6.3	81.2
- .3 to - .4	1	1.7	96.6				1	3.1	75.9
- .1 to - .2	2	3.3	94.9	2	8.7	100.0	1	3.1	71.8
0	6	10.2	91.6	2	8.7	91.3	4	12.3	68.7
.1 to .2	2	3.3	81.4				5	15.6	56.4
.3 to .4	6	10.2	78.1	2	8.7	82.6	3	9.5	40.8
.5 to .6	3	5.1	67.9	2	8.7	73.9	5	15.6	31.3
.7 to .8	8	13.6	62.8	3	13.3	65.2	2	6.3	15.7
.9 to 1.0	4	6.8	49.2	1	4.3	51.9			
1.1 to 1.2	5	8.5	42.4	2	8.7	47.6			
1.3 to 1.4	8	13.6	33.9	2	8.7	38.9	2	6.3	9.4
1.5 to 1.6	3	5.1	20.3	1	4.3	30.2	1	3.1	3.1
1.7 to 1.8	4	6.8	15.2	2	8.7	25.9			
1.9 to 2.0	2	3.3	8.4						
2.1 to 2.2	1	1.7	5.1	1	4.3	17.2			
2.3 to 2.4				1	4.3	12.9			
2.5 to 2.6	1	1.7	3.4	1	4.3	8.6			
2.7 to 2.8	1	1.7	1.7						
2.9 to 3.0				1	4.3	4.3			
3.1 to 3.2									
3.3 to 3.4									
3.5 to 3.6									
3.7 to 3.8									
TOTAL	59			23			32		

DISTRICT #22

NEW YORK STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS TO AID UNDERACHIEVERS

Final Evaluation Report

June, 1972

Irene S. Shigaki

New York University

Background

A survey of the reading failures of children in the 2nd grade in District 22 indicated a need for early identification and remediation of 1st graders with reading problems. Recognizing the need for remediation on an individual or small group basis, it was felt that the deployment of educational assistants would be a viable means of providing aid. Although educational assistants have been used in various capacities in the lower elementary grades of some schools in the district for as long as four years, the 1971-1972 school year was the first full year of the operation of this program.

The program was instituted in ten elementary schools with a staff of 20 educational assistants assigned to them, according to need. Eight schools received two assistants and two schools four assistants each. The program operated on a budget of $121,165 with most of the funds allocated to the salaries of the educational assistants. The budget breakdown was as follows:

Nonpedagogic personnel (Educational Assistants)	$ 98,992
Employee benefits	10,908
Evaluation	5,495
5% Overhead	5,770
TOTAL	$ 121,165

The objectives for the Program were as follows:

1. As a result of the deployment of educational assistants in the classroom, 75% of the students affected by these people will show gains of at least 6 months in reading on a standardized test.

2. Furthermore, the utilization of educational assistants will allow for 20% more time for teaching and individualization of instruction.

The first project objective was modified from the original which called for 75% of the students being affected achieving grade level in reading and mathematics. The rationale for the change included two components. First, the educational assistants were being assigned to classrooms on the basis of the need for remediation. It has been demonstrated that the growth rate of children requiring remediation is slower than that of the normal child, consequently a more realistic goal would be an indication of reasonable growth rather than performance to grade level. Second, achievement in mathematics, unlike reading, is more directly related to a specific curriculum. As a result, it is not possible to reliably assess the comparative progress of children in this area. Further, since the program was instituted primarily to upgrade reading ability and since this is the curriculum area receiving major emphasis in the early grades, it was felt that performance on a measure of reading would be a sufficient index of the effectiveness of the educational assistants.

Data Collection

The data gathered for the evaluation consisted of the following: Interviews and questionnaires completed by a sample of principals, educational assistants, and teachers with educational assistants; structured observations of the educational assistant at work; pre-and post-test scores on the reading section of the Wide Range Achievement Test administered by evaluation staff to a sample of children in classes aided by educational

assistants; and a factor questionnaire for each child tested completed by the teacher concerning background information for that particular child. Three sample schools were selected where the principals were interviewed, observations made, and children tested. Questionnaires and interviews were conducted with some assistants and teachers in the three sample schools supplemented by responses from a sampling of staff from five other schools. The three schools from which much of the data were gathered were P.S. 139, P.S. 193, and P.S. 251.

Questionnaires and Interviews

Early in the fall of 1971 questionnaires were completed by a sample of seven of the 20 educational assistants. Interviews were conducted with the three principals of the sample schools in late fall. Additional interviews were conducted in late winter with nine of the 20 educational assistants (one assistant responded to the earlier questionnaire as well) and eight teachers who had been assigned an assistant. The information gathered from these sources were highly related and will be summarized below.

Objectives of Program

There was high agreement on the primary objectives of the program. All respondents, principals, teachers and educational assistants replied that the primary objective of the program was to give additional attention to those children in the early grades who were slow learners or performing below grade level, preferably through an individualized approach.

The 20 educational assistants were selected from applicants to the District Office. Upon assessment through a written application and an interview, selection of educational assistants and assignment to schools were made. Most of the educational assistants interviewed cited their enjoyment of working with children as their primary motivation for application

for the position.

Assignment of educational assistants to teachers were made by the principals of each building. Generally the criterion employed was selection of classes at the bottom of the grade with priority given to first grade classes. Through the interviews with teachers it was learned that there was a tendency to assign assistants to those who had not been in the building long or had little experience on that grade. While most assistants worked with only one class continuously, a few assistants divided their time among as many as three different classes. This pattern varied from school to school.

The assistants formed a stable unit with all 20 remaining in their position for the 1971-1972 academic year. In some cases the assistant had been in the building as an assistant the previous year, with a few working in the building in varying capacities for a number of years.

Role of Educational Assistant

There was high agreement between the educational assistants and the teachers concerning the role of the former. All agreed that the top priority was working with small groups or individual children in the area of reading. Some educational assistants and teachers also cited the math area and generally helping in the classroom. The educational assistants reported that they usually reviewed the work that the teacher had presented with the children, including drill work on certain reading skills. A few mentioned that they also introduced new material. Both educational assistants and teachers stated that the teacher generally assigned the specific classroom duties, while a few assistants made decisions for themselves. Most assistants had no contact with the homes of the children. One talked to parents of the children with whom she worked during Open School Day, one called parents in the name of the

teacher, and one had casual contact with parents as a resident of the community. By and large though there was agreement on the importance of the educational assistant's work in reading, the nature of the responsibility was determined by the individual classroom teacher.

Role of the Teacher

Most of the teachers interviewed felt that their primary role was to assign material to be taught and select the children with whom the assistant should work. In addition, some felt they should provide general guidance for the assistant and serve as a resource with whom the assistant could discuss her classroom problems. The majority of the educational assistants and teachers felt that their working relationships were very good. No one was unhappy with the working relationship, although it was learned that prior to the interviews one educational assistant had been reassigned due to a personality conflict with the teacher.

Planning Time

Planning time was allocated in a variety of ways from school to school and from classroom to classroom. In some schools the teacher and paraprofessional could plan during their prep periods. This was not usually possible in those schools where an educational assistant worked with more than one teacher. In some cases planning time was available in the morning before school or casual conferences were held throughout the day as the need arose. All but one of the eight teachers interviewed felt that sufficient time was available for planning together with the educational assistant, but four of the nine educational assistants interviewed felt that insufficient time was available. Though the majority of both groups felt that adequate time was available, the responses from the educational assistants reflected a greater need for planning time on their part than the teachers.

Teaching Time

As one of the objectives of the program was to free the teacher to allocate more of her time to teaching, the teachers interviewed were asked if they felt that the assistants permitted them more time to teach. All but one of the eight interviewed answered affirmatively. The teacher who did not, explained that it was difficult to determine. Most of the teachers felt that since the educational assistants worked with the slower children and the special problem children, the teacher was freed to devote more time to the rest of the class.

Preparation of Educational Assistants

Of the ten educational assistants interviewed all were high school graduates and six had some college education. Those six were currently working toward a baccalaureate degree or enrolled in a community college. The professional goal of four of the ten was to eventually become a teacher, four wanted to continue as an educational assistant, and two were unsure.

Those who had not had experience in the schools prior to employment in the program received a week of training in the District Office from Mrs. Weiner, the State Urban Coordinator and Consultants in the areas of reading and mathematics. At the time of the interviews in February, 1972, the majority had not had any in-service training since the initial training at the beginning of the year. Since then a few training sessions have been reported. The teachers interviewed generally were not aware of any training sessions except in the few cases where the assistant had brought ideas back into the classroom. Both educational assistants and teachers felt that there was a need for further training sessions particularly in the area of teaching methods. Several educational assistants also voiced a need for additional background in working with

difficult children.

It should also be mentioned that most of the educational assistants received some supervision in addition to that of the teacher's. In some schools the principal assumed this responsibility, in others the assistant principal or the reading teacher.

Program Assessment

All principals interviewed were enthusiastic about the program. Among the teachers most were enthusiastic. One teacher who was only slightly positive had had a personality conflict with her educational assistant and qualified her response by stating that the quality of the program depended upon the assistant assigned. The majority of the assistants interviewed were enthusiastic about the program as well. Reasons cited by the three groups for their enthusiasm included the additional assistance that the children were now able to receive and the children's improvement in reading. Among recommendations that were made by the teachers were that the educational assistant should be in the class for longer periods of time (from teachers who shared their assistant with another teacher) and additional training for the assistants. The paraprofessionals too felt that they should have additional training. They also requested more supplies and more adequate teaching facilities. Often supplies were shared with several other rooms and assistants were found working with children in the teachers' room, lunchroom and other available areas.

Classroom Observations

In order to obtain further data concerning the extent to which the presence of the educational assistant freed the teacher to spend a greater proportion of her time in instruction, structured observations were made. The original plan called for observations of teachers with assistants and a comparison group of teachers without assistants. After visiting schools in the program, the original plan was not found to be feasible for the educational assistants were generally assigned to the lowest classes on a grade as mentioned earlier, so that true comparison classes were not available. It has generally been found that a greater proportion of time is spent in procedural and managerial functions by the teacher in a lower exponent classroom, so that unless it were possible to match the ability level of the classes a meaningful comparison could not be made. However, it was felt that observations in a sample of classrooms in the program would reveal the nature of the utilization of the additional personnel.

Consequently, all the educational assistants in the three sample schools (P.S. 139, P.S. 193, and P.S. 251) were observed six times (during the winter of 1971-1972) following a predetermined schedule which attempted to randomize the time of observations. Observations were made for fifteen minute segments with selected information tabulated at one minute intervals. The observation instrument included categories for the size of the instructional group; type of instructional activity, with subdivisions including reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, science and other curricular areas; other activities including clerical, routine, discipline, supervision and other; the cognitive level of instruction including procedural motoric, memory or factual thinking, convergent thinking, divergent thinking and evaluative thinking; and the pattern of interaction between the educational

assistant and the teacher, whether she was assisting, working independently either autonomously, cooperatively or in parallel behavior, and other patterns; and space for general comments. It was possible to make observations of both the teacher and assistant simultaneously while using the guide. However, it was found that in the majority of situations, the educational assistant worked with a small group of children outside of the classroom. In these cases, observations were made only of the educational assistant.

Tabulations under teaching pattern revealed that most teachers and educational assistants worked independently (see Table I). This can be interpreted to mean that the average amount of instructional time was doubled with the presence of an educational assistant. However, several points must be kept in mind. The educational assistant usually worked with a small group averaging around five or with individual children. Further, the children with whom they worked were generally those who were behind academically and individuals who would normally require considerable attention from the teacher. Finally, as determined in the interviews and further substantiated below, the nature of the instruction given by the assistants was primarily drill work and reinforcement of the teacher's lessons.

Table II indicates the average percentage of time each educational assistant spent in a variety of classroom activities. It can be seen that instructional activities took well over half of their time with a range of from 55.6% to 77.9% of the time. Among the instructional areas reading received the greatest proportion of time ranging from 25.4% to 76.6% of the time. It should be noted that the assistant who allocated 25.4% of her time to instruction in reading gave 31.5% of her time to instruction

in mathematics, while the assistant devoting 76.6% of her to reading was observed to be engaged only in this instructional area. This breakdown indicates that the instructional priorities of the program were receiving the greatest proportion of the instructional time from the assistants. One could not expect an assistant to spend all of her time in instruction since many procedural matters must also receive attention.

In looking at the level of interaction (see Table III) one finds that the predominant level employed is that of cognitive memory or a factual level of instruction. This is in agreement with responses to the interviews which indicated that the educational assistants spent much of their instructional time in drill activities and reinforcing the instruction of the teacher. The second largest block of instructional time was devoted to procedural matters ranging from 10.8% to 40.3% of the time. Such activities would including passing out papers, determining an order of response, etc. Very little time was devoted to the cultivation of the higher thought process of convergent, divergent and evaluative thinking.

Reading Achievement

The reading section from the Wide Range Achievement Test was selected to be administered to a sample of children in classes to which educational assistants had been assigned. The manual reports reliability coefficients of .98 and above when administered to children comparable in age to that of the sample.[1] The manual futher reports coefficients of .81 and above between the reading section and another measure of reading.[2] Though the

---

[1] J.F. Jastak and S.R. Jastak. The Wide Range Achievement Test Manual of Instructions, Revised Edition. Wilmington, Delaware: Guidance Associates, 1965, p. 13.

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

WRAT tests primarily letter and word recognition and not reading comprehension, it was felt to be an appropriate choice since the bulk of the target population were beginning first grade and would perform below the floor of reading comprehension tests.

At the beginning of November, 1971 a member of the evaluation staff administered the reading portion of the WRAT to a randomly selected sample of 110 children in classes with educational assistants in the three sample schools. The test was administered on an individual basis following directions given in the manual. The sample was retested with the same test in May, 1972. Due to attrition and absentees, a total of 77 children were both pre- and post-tested. The objective of the program was that 75% of the children would show gains of at least six months in reading as a result of the program. Since the test is calibrated on a deciminal system rather than 12 calendar months, the equivalent gain on the test would be .5. Table IV tabulates the gain scores for the children in the three sample schools by school and by grade. Gain scores were computed by subtracting the pre-test scores from the post-test scores. It can be seen that 92% of the children have attained the growth criterion as stated in the objective for the program.

Factor Questionnaire

In order to determine the extent to which background pupil variables were related to reading performance, a factor questionnaire was devised to be completed by the teachers of those children who had been tested with the WRAT. The questionnaire asked for information concerning the child's attendance, mobility, academic performance, conduct, need for psychological assistance and other pertinent background data (see appendix). Correlations between these variables and the post-test score

and the gain scores were computed.

Four variables were found to be significantly correlated with either the post-test or the gain scores. These variables were reading readiness, general academic performance, classroom conduct and perceived need for psychological assistance. The correlations are tabulated in Table V.

It would appear from these data that reading readiness scores have some predictive value of reading achievement, particularly in the early grades. The intercorrelations between general academic ability and conduct with the post-test and gains scores seem reasonable. Since reading is one of the primary academic areas, one would expect general academic ability to reflect reading ability. In like manner, one would expect positive conduct to be related to reading achievement on the assumption that the extent to which the student is attending will influence his growth in a given area.

The significant correlations with perceived need for psychological assistance, however, are more puzzling. In all cases the correlations are negative and contrary to usual expectations. One possible explanation might be that the classroom teachers are not a reliable source of information concerning the child's need for psychological assistance. This finding must be regarded tentatively and requires further exploration.

Though the obtained significant correlations are low to moderate, they do indicate that some student variables are also related to reading achievement. This may be merely documenting the obvious, but too often the success or failure of special Programs is attributed solely to the intervention without acknowledgement of other influential variables.

Summary and Recommendations

Upon examination of all the sources of data, one can conclude that the program for Educational Assistants to Aid Underachievers has been successfully implemented. The pre- and post-test scores on the WRAT indicate that the selected sample of children have made reasonable growth in reading. Further, it can be inferred from interviews and observations that a substantial increase in instructional time has resulted with the addition of the educational assistant to the classroom. It it, therefore, recommended that the program be continued.

As with any educational innovation, adjustments can be made to further refine the program. Suggestions in this vein are as follows:

1. Additional training for the educational assistants is necessary. Workshops in the methodology of teaching reading and mathematics as well as the psychology of the difficult child should be provided. Familiarizing educational assistants with the relationship of teacher verbal behavior and the level of pupil thought process deserves consideration. Some joint training time including the teacher and the educational assistant would serve to provide greater articulation between the workshops and the classroom situation in addition to serving as a vehicle for helping teachers play the more supportive role that some educational assistants seek.
2. Adequate planning time should be allocated during which teachers and their educational assistants can make appropriate instructional plans. Every encouragement should be given to joint planning on more than a casual basis.

3. Assignment of an assistant to one class is recommended. At most she should be assigned to two classes to alleviate the fragmented contact that occurs when she is assigned to several rooms.
4. If the educational assistant continues to work with small groups outside of the classroom, exploration of more adequate space should be made to minimize interruptions.

TABLE I

Summary of Working Pattern
Between Assistant and Teacher

No. of Observations	Assisting	Independently
48	6 (12%)	42 (88%)

TABLE II

Percentage of Time Spent in Various Classroom Activities by Individual Educational Assistants

Educ. Ass't.	Instruction					Other Activities					
	Read	L.A.	Math	Other	Sub-Total	Clerical	Routine	Disc.	Superv.	Other	Sub-Total
139-1	60.0	15.0	--	--	76.0	14.5	8.0	1.5	--	--	24.0
139-2	42.4	9.8	--	3.4	55.6	23.2	10.1	2.1	--	9.0	44.4
139-3	76.6	--	--	--	76.6	3.4	5.6	3.4	1.0	10.0	23.4
139-4	43.3	16.7	12.4		72.4	1.3	20.2	3.5	1.3	1.3	27.6
193-1	25.4	10.0	31.5	2.2	69.1	4.4	13.3	2.2	5.5	5.5	30.9
193-2	58.9	5.6	11.2	2.2	77.9	2.2	4.4	2.2	6.6	6.7	22.1
251-1	51.1	4.6	--	--	55.7	12.4	18.3	9.0	--	4.6	44.3
251-2	54.2	7.8	--	--	62.0	12.1	20.0	2.6	--	3.3	38.0

TABLE III

Percentage of Time Spent in Each Level
of Interaction by Individual Educational Assistants

Educ. Ass't.	Performance	Motoric	Memory	Convergent	Divergent	Evaluative
139-1	15.9	2.2	81.9	--	--	--
139-2	29.1	--	71.9	--	--	--
139-3	10.8	5.7	82.2	--	--	1.3
139-4	20.6	--	78.2	--	--	1.2
193-1	30.0	2.0	63.0	--	--	5.0
193-2	15.2	--	81.3	3.5	--	--
251-1	40.3	--	58.5	--	1.2	
251-2	28.7	2.6	68.7	--	--	--

TABLE IV

Distribution of Differences Between Pre- and
Post-Test WRAT Scores in Reading
By School and Grade

Gains	P. S. 139 Grade 1	P. S. 139 Grade 2	P.S. 193 Grade 1	P.S. 251 Grade 1	Total	%	Cum %
0 to .4	1	3		3	7	08	100
.5 to .9	6	13	8	2	29	39	92
1.0 to 1.4	7	6	3	5	21	28	53
1.5 to 1.9	3	1		7	11	14	25
2.0 to 2.4	3	2		2	7	08	11
2.5 to 2.9		1		1	2	03	03
Total	20	26	11	20	77		

TABLE V

Intercorrelations Between Selected Pupil Background Variables and Post-Test and Gain Scores on the WRAT (Number in parenthesis indicate size of sample)

	2	3	4	5	6
1. Reading Readiness	.67* (31)	.43 (30)	-.36 (30)	.57 (31)	.48* (30)
2. General Academic		.62* (73)	-.44* (73)	.41* (74)	.35* (73)
3. Conduct			-.51* (72)	.31* (73)	.35* (72)
4. Need for Psychological Assistance				-.33* (73)	-.11 (72)
5. Post-test					.74* (73)
6. Gain					

*Significant beyond the .01 level

State Urban Education Programs

Appendices

STATE URBAN COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Date:_____

1. How were the State Urban Programs originally formulated?

   a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

   b. Junior High Reading Labs

   c. Educational Assistants

   d. Teacher Trainers

2. Describe the objectives of the State Urban Programs:

   a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

   b. Junior High Reading Labs

   c. Educational Assistants

   d. Teacher Trainers

3. As coordinator how would you define your role? (policy setting, supervisory visits to schools, primarily administrative, etc.)

4. What is your assessment of the achievement of the objectives of the Programs to date?

   a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

   b. Junior High Reading Labs

   c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

5. How are the budgets for each program allocated?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

6. How were the staffs for the programs selected?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

7. Was there an orientation session for the program staffs? If so what were the extent and nature of the orientation?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

8. Is there regular inservice training or scheduled meetings for the Program staffs? If so, what is its extent and nature?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

9. Do staff members have any influence in shaping program goals? Please explain.

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

10. What is the general staff attitudes toward each program?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

11. What do you consider the primary strengths of each program?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

12. What alterations in each program would you recommend for the future?

a. Diagnostic & Remedial Reading Center

b. Junior High Reading Labs

c. Educational Assistants

d. Teacher Trainers

Educational Assistant Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Diagnostic Reading Center)

Assistant:_____ Interviewer:_____

Teacher:_____ Date:_____

1. Why did you decide to become an educational assistant? (Probe: Did anyone tell you that this would be a good job for you?)

2. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think the program was started?)

3. How were you selected to work in this program?

4. How long have you been an assistant in this program?_____(# of yrs. including this one)

5. (For those who have been in the program more than one year:) In general, how does this year compare with last year? a.___Better b.___Same c.___Worse

6. (If better or worse) How was it better or worse? (Probe: Why do you think it's better or worse?)

7. How do you feel about the program?
   a.___Enthusiastic b.___Positive, but not enthusiastic c.___Slightly positive
   d.___Slightly negative e.___Strongly negative
   Why?

8. What are your main duties? (Probe: What do you do? Is there anything else you do?)

9. How much education have you had?
   a. High School Graduate
   b. Some college
   c. Associate of Arts Degree (2 years)
   d. Bachelor of Arts Degree
   e. Other. Indicate:_____

10. Are you currently going to school? Please explain.

11. What professional goals do you have for yourself? (Probe: A few years from now what do you think you will be doing?)

12. Did you receive any training before you began working in the classroom? Please explain.

13. Do you receive any in-service training now? Please explain.

14. What recommendations would you make for improving your training?

15. Do you think the children have been helped by the project? How?

16. What do you like the best about the program?

17. What would you like to change about the program?

18. Then you feel the program should be:
    a. Continued as is
    b. Continued with changes
    c. Discontinued

19. General comments:

Teacher Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Diagnostic Reading Center)

Teacher:_____ Interviewer:_____

Assistants:_____ Date:_____

1. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think the program was started?)

2. How were you selected for this position?

3. How long have you been teaching in this program?____(# of yrs. including this one)

4. (If in the program more than one year:) In general, how does this year compare with last year? a.___Better b.___Same c.___Worse

5. (If better or worse) How was it better or worse? (Probe: Why do you think it's better or worse?)

6. What children are eligible for the program?

7. What is the nature of the instruction that the children receive? (Probe: What materials and/or methods are used to teach the children?)

8. How long do the children remain in the program?

9. How do you feel about the program?
a.___Enthusiastic b.___Positive, but not enthusiastic c.___Slightly positive
d.___Slightly negative e.___Strongly negative
Why?

Teacher-DRC

10. What do you see as your role in the program?

11. What is the role of the psychologist?

12. What are the main duties of the assistants?

13. Do you have any suggestions concerning the improvement of utilization of program personnel?

14. Planning sessions:
    a. Is there time for the program staff to plan together?

    b. What is the nature of these planning sessions?

15. What is the background experience and training:
    a. of the teacher?

    b. of the psychologist?

    c. of the assistants?

Teacher-DRC

16. What recommendations would you make for improving the training:
    a. for the teacher?

    b. for the psychologist?

    c. for the assistants?

17. Do you think the children have been helped by the project? How?

18. What do you like best about the program?

19. What would you like to change about the program?

20. Then you feel the project should be
    a. Continued as is
    b. Continued with changes
    c. Discontinued

21. General comments:

Psychologist Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Diagnostic Reading Center)

Psychologist:_____ Interviewer:_____ Date:_____

1. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think the program was started?)

2. How were you selected for this position?

3. What is your background experience and training?

4. How do you feel about the program?
   a.___Enthusiastic b.___Positive, but not enthusiastic c.___Slightly positive
   d.___Slightly negative e.___Strongly negative
   Why?

5. What do you see as your role in the program?

6. Testing:
   a. How are children referred to you for testing?

   b. How many children are you able to test in a week?

   c. How much of your time is spent in testing?

   d. What battery of tests do you administer?

   e. To whom are the results made available?

   f. What do you feel the testing program contributes to the Diagnostic Reading Center?

Psychologist - DRC

7. Counseling:
   a. How are children selected for counseling?

   b. How much of your time is spent in counseling sessions?

   c. How frequently do you see the children?

   d. How many children do you see during a semester?

   e. What is the nature of the counseling sessions?

   f. How long is each session?

   g. To whom is a report of the counseling sessions made available?

   h. What is the exact nature of the information which is reported?

   i. What do you feel the counseling contributes to the Diagnostic Reading Program?

8. Do you think the children have been helped by the project? How?

9. What do you like the best about the program?

10. What would you like to change about the program?

11. Then you feel the project should be
    a.___Continued as is b.___Continued with changes c.___Discontinued

12. General comments:

Principal Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Educational Assistants)

School_____ Date_____

---

1. Will you describe the community in which your School is located?

_____

_____

_____

2. What is the size of your school?_____

3. What are the objectives of the Educational Assistant Program in your school?_____

_____

_____

4. How were the Educational Assistants selected in your school?_____

_____

_____

5. How were the Educational Assistants assigned to the classes?_____

_____

_____

6. Is there an orientation session for the Educational Assistants? Yes____ No____

If yes, what does it entail?_____

_____

7. Is there any type of supervision for the Educational Assistants? Yes____ No____

If yes, what does it entail? (Who supervises, A.P. or Principal) (Group meetings of Ed. Asst. or individual) (group meetings of ed. asst. and teachers), and how frequently do these meetings occur?_____

_____

_____

8. What are the duties of the Educational Assistants?

9. What recommendations would you suggest for improving the Educational Assistants training?

10. How do you feel about the program?

_____a. Enthusiastic

_____b. Positive, but not enthusiastic

_____c. Slightly positive

_____d. Slightly negative

_____e. Strongly negative

11. In general, how does this year's program compare with those of previous years?

12. In what ways, if any, would you like to see the programs change?

Teacher Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Educational Assistants)

School:_____ Grade:_____

Teacher:_____ Interviewer:_____

Assistant:_____ Date:_____

1. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think the prog was started?)

2. How long have you been teaching in this building?

_____(# of years including this one)

3. How long have you been teaching this grade?

_____(# of years including this one)

4. How long have you had an assistant in this program?

_____(# of years including this one)

5. (For those who have been in the program more than one year.)
In general, how does this year compare with last year?

a. Better
b. Same
c. Worse

6. (If better or worse) How was it better or worse? (Probe: Why do you think it's better or worse?)

7. Why was an assistant assigned to you?

8. How was assignment of your particular assistant made?

9. How many assistants have you worked with this year?
Please explain.

Teacher

10. How do you feel about the program?
    a. Enthusiastic
    b. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    c. Slightly positive
    d. Slightly negative
    e. Strongly negative

    Why?

11. What do you see as your role in the program?

12. What are the main duties of the assistant?

13. Does the assistant allow you more time to teach?
    Please explain.

14. What is your working relationship with the assistant like? (Probe: How do you get along together?)

15. Is there time for you to discuss and plan together with the assistant?

16. Who assigns the classroom duties to the assistant?

17. What do you think of the preparation for the job that the assistant has received?
    a. Highly satisfactory
    b. Adequate
    c. Unsatisfactory

18. What do you think of the preparation or on-the-job training that the assistant is currently receiving?
    a. Highly satisfactory
    b. Adequate
    c. Unsatisfactory

19. What recommendations would you make for improving the training?

20. Do you think the children have been helped by the project?
How?

21. Does the assistant have any contact with the homes of the children? (Probe: Does the assistant meet the parents?)

22. What do you like the best about the program?

23. What would you like to change about the program?

24. Then you feel the project should be
    a. Continued as is
    b. Continued with changes
    c. Discontinued

25. General comments:

Educational Assistant Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Educational Assistants)

School:_____ Grade:_____

Assistant:_____ Interviewer:_____

Teacher:_____ Date:_____

1. Why did you decide to become an educational assistant? (Probe: Did anyone tell you that this would be a good job for you?)

2. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think this program was started?)

3. How do you feel about the project?
   a. Enthusiastic
   b. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   c. Slightly positive
   d. Slightly negative
   e. Strongly negative

   Why?

4. How long have you been an assistant in this program?

   _____(# of years including this one)

5. (For those who have been in the program more than one year.)
   In general, how does this year compare with last year?
   a. Better
   b. Same
   c. Worse

6. (If better or worse) How was it better or worse?
   (Probe: Why do you think it's better or worse?)

7. How long have you been employed in this building?

   _____(# of years including this one)

8. What are your main duties?
   (Probe: What do you do? Is there anything else you do?)

9. How much time do you spend in the classroom?

_____(# of hours daily)

10. For what subject areas are you usually responsible? (Probe: Do you usually work in reading? Math? Anything else?)

11. About how much time do you spend each day teaching reading?

_____ (# of hours daily)

12. With how many children do you usually work?

Does this vary with the subject?

13. What kind of work do you usually do with the children?

a. Do you review what the teacher has done?

b. Do you drill on certain skills?

c. Do you present new material?

14. What is your working relationship with the teacher like? (Probe: How do you get along together?)

15. Is there time for you to discuss and plan together with the teacher?

16. How do you decide what things you are to do? (Probe: Who assigns the classroom duties to you?)

17. How much education have you had?
    a. High School Graduate
    b. Some college
    c. Associate of Arts Degree (2 years)
    d. Bachelor of Arts Degree
    e. Other. Indicate:_____

18. Are you currently going to school? Please explain.

19. What professional goals do you have for yourself? (Probe: A few years from now what do you think you will be doing?)

20. Did you receive any training before you began working in the classroom?

    a. Where?

    b. For how long?

    c. With whom?

    d. What did you cover?

21. Do you receive any in-service training now?

    a. Where?

    b. How often?

    c. With whom?

    d. What do you do?

22. What else do you think should be covered in the training sessions?

23. How helpful has the training been to you in helping you on the job?
    a. Greatly
    b. Somewhat
    c. Not at all

24. Does anyone beside the teacher supervise you?

    a. Who?

    b. How often?

    c. What do they do?

25. Do you think the children have been helped by the project?

    How?

26. Do you have any contact with the homes of the children? (Probe: Do you meet the parents?)

27. What do you like the best about the program?

28. What would you like to change about the program?

29. Then you feel the project should be:
    a. Continued as is
    b. Continued with changes
    c. Discontinued

30. General comments:

Observation Symbols

A = Assistant
T = Teacher
} No. of children with whom he is interacting

R = Reading
L = Language Arts
M = Mathematics
S = Social Studies
C = Science
O = Other (Specify)
} Instruction

C = Clerical (checking papers, attendance, etc.)
R = Routine (getting ready for lunch, passing out supplies, etc.)
D = Discipline
S = Supervising (watching children work without helping)
O = Other (specify)
} Activity

P = Performance
T = Motoric
M = Cognitive-memory
C = Convergent thinking
D = Divergent thinking
E = Evaluative thinking
} Level

A = Assisting

A = Autonomous
C = Cooperative
P = Parallel
} Independent

Other

} Pattern

Appropriate tallies are made at one minute intervals

Teachers_____ Assistants_____ Workshops_____ Time_____ Date_____

Class sizes_____ Interviewers_____ (Indicate teacher's activity with 0, assistant's with X)

	No.		Activity: Instructor A T R L M S C O L R D E O	Level P T H C O E	Pattern: A	Ind. A C P	O	COMMENTS: Assistant	Teacher	General
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										

JHS Reading Laboratory

Questionnaire for Administrator

School:_____ Date:_____

Name:_____ Title:_____

1. Will you describe the community in which your school is located?

2. What is the size of your school?

3. What are the objectives of the JHS Reading Lab program?

4. How are children selected for this program in your building?

5. Role definition (& working relationship)

   a. What is the primary function of the teacher in this program?

   b. What is the primary function of the educational assistants?

6. Selection

   a. How was the teacher selected for this task?

   b. How were the educational assistants selected?

7. Training

   a. Has the teacher received or currently receiving training for his job? If so, what is the nature of the training?

   b. Have the educational assistants received or are they currently receiving training for their jobs? If so, what is the nature of the training?

8. How many years has the program been in operation in your school?

9. What recommendations would you suggest for improving the quality of the program?

10. How do you feel about the program?
    ____a. Enthusiastic
    ____b. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    ____c. Slightly positive
    ____d. Slightly negative
    ____e. Strongly negative

11. In general, how does this year's program compare with that of previous years?

12. In what ways, if any, would you like to see the program changed?

Educational Assistant Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Junior High Reading Lab)

School:_____ Grade:_____

Assistant:_____ Interviewer:_____

Teacher:_____ Date:_____

1. Why did you decide to become an educational assistant? (Probe: Did anyone tell you that this would be a good job for you?)

2. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think the program was started?)

3. How were you selected to work in this program?

4. How long have you been an assistant in this program?____(# of yrs. including this one)

5. (For those who have been in the program more than one year) In general, how does this year compare with last year? a.___Better b.___Same c.___Worse

6. (If better or worse) How was it better or worse? (Probe: Why do you think it's better or worse?)

7. How do you feel about the program?
a.___Enthusiastic b.___Positive, but not enthusiastic c.___Slightly positive
d.___Slightly negative e.___Strongly negative
Why?

8. What are your main duties? (Probe: What do you do? Is there anything else you do?)

9. How much education have you had?
   a. High School Graduate
   b. Some college
   c. Associate of Arts Degree (2 years)
   d. Bachelor of Arts Degree
   e. Other. Indicate_____

10. Are your currently going to school? Please explain.

11. What professional goals do you have for yourself?
(Probe: A few years from now what do you think you will be doing?)

12. Did you receive any training before you began working in the classroom? Please explain.

13. Do you receive any in-service training now? Please explain.

14. What recommendations would you make for improving your training?

15. Do you think the children have been helped by the project? How?

16. What do you like the best about the program?

17. What would you like to change about the program?

18. Then you feel the program should be:
    a. Continued as is
    b. Continued with changes
    c. Discontinued

19. General comments:

Teacher Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Junior High Reading Lab)

School:_____ Grade:_____

Teacher:_____ Interviewer:_____

Assistants:_____ Date:_____

1. What do you think is the purpose of the program? (Probe: Why do you think the program was started?)

2. How were you selected for this position?

3. How long have you been teaching in this program? _____(# of years including this one)

4. (For those who have been in the program more than one year:) In general, how does this year compare with last year? a.___Better b.___Same c.___Worse

5. (If better or worse) How was it better or worse? (Probe: Why do you think it's better or worse?

6. How are the children selected for this program?

7. What is the nature of the instruction that the children receive? (Probe: What materials and/or methods are used to teach the children?)

8. How long do the children remain in the program?

9. How do you feel about the program:
a.___Enthusiastic b.___Positive, but not enthusiastic c.___Slightly positive
d.___Slightly negative e.___Strongly negative
Why?

10. What do you see as your role in the program?

11. What are the main duties of the assistants?

12. What is the background experience and training:
    a. Of the teacher?

    b. Of the assistants?

13. What recommendations would you make for improving the training:
    a. for the teacher?

    b. for the assistants?

14. Do you think the children have been helped by the project? How?

15. What do you like the best about the program?

16. What would you like to change about the program?

17. Then you feel the project should b
    a. Continued as is
    b. Continued with changes
    c. Discontinued

18. General comments:

Teacher Trainer Questionnaire

Principal Questionnaire

School_____ Date_____

---

1. What are the objectives of the Teacher Trainer Program in your school?_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How many years has the program been operating in the school?_____

3. How were the teachers that the Teacher Trainer works with selected?_____

_____

_____

4. Is there an orientation session for the Teacher Trainer? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, what does it entail?

5. What are the duties of the Teacher Trainer?_____

_____

_____

6. What are the result of the Teacher Trainer program in your school?_____

_____

_____

_____

7. How do you feel about the program?
   - _____a. Enthusiastic
   - _____b. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   - _____c. Slightly positive
   - _____d. Slightly negative
   - _____e. Strongly negative

8. In general, how does this year's program compare with those of previous years?_____

_____

9. In what ways, if any, would you like to see the program change?

Questionnaire for Teacher Trainers
(State Urban Education Programs)

Name:_____ School Schedule:_____

Date:_____

1. What are the main objectives of the Teacher Trainer Program?

2. What is the nature of your job? (Probe: What might you do on a typical day?)

3. What is the nature of your contact with each school administration? (Do you receive sufficient help from the administration to be able to carry out your duties?)

4. Are sufficient resources and materials available to you to carry out your responsibilities?

5. Have you received any in-service training for your position? If so, what is the nature of the training. If not, would you like to have some--in what areas?

6. How do you feel that your effectiveness as a teacher trainer might be best assessed?

7. What do you like the best about the program?

8. What would you like to change about the program?

9. Then you feel the project should be:
   a. Continued as is
   b. Continued with changes
   c. Discontinued

10. How do you feel about the project?
   a. Enthusiastic
   b. Positive, but not enthusiastic
   c. Slightly positive
   d. Slightly negative
   e. Strongly negative

   Why?

Classroom Teacher Interview Form
(State Urban Education Programs - Teacher Trainers)

Teacher_____ School_____ Grade_____
Trainer_____ Interviewer_____ Date_____

1. How many times have you had professional contact with the teacher trainer?_____
2. Check those areas which were explored with the teacher trainer:

	Regressed	None	Some Improvement	Much Improvement
____ Discipline	1	2	3	4
Demonstration lessons:				
____ Math	1	2	3	4
____ Reading	1	2	3	4
____ Other_____	1	2	3	4
____ _____	1	2	3	4
____ _____	1	2	3	4
____ Evaluation of activities	1	2	3	4
____ Acquisition of Materials	1	2	3	4
____ Preparation of Materials	1	2	3	4
____ Classroom Planning	1	2	3	4
____ Establishing routines	1	2	3	4
____ Other_____	1	2	3	4
____ _____	1	2	3	4

Rate your growth as influenced by the teacher trainer in the areas checked above.

3. Rate the effectiveness of the teacher trainer in each of the areas below:

	Not Appropriate	Low		Average		High
Availability of materials & resources	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Accessibility	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Skill in holding conference & working with others	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Demonstration Lessons	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of subject matter areas	NA	1	2	3	4	5
General knowledge of Education	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Other_____	NA	1	2	3	4	5
_____	NA	1	2	3	4	5

4. How do you feel about the program? a.___Enthusiastic b.___Positive, but not enthusiastic c.___Slightly positive d.___Slightly negative e.___Strongly negative. Why?

5. What suggestions do you have for improving the program?

6. General comments:

DISTRICT 22 EVALUATION

Below are some questions that will assist the evaluation team in judging the effectiveness of state and federally supported programs. The time you take in answering them will be most appreciated and will help improve these programs.

When there is no evidence available on student records, we would appreciate your best estimate.

Thank you very much for assisting us in this important evaluation task.

STUDENT'S NAME_____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(Circle his or her present grade level)

TEACHER'S NAME_____

1. Is this student bussed into the district? Yes____No____Don't know____

2. How often has the student changed his place of residence during the past two years? Circle the appropriate number. 1 2 3 4 5 or more

3. Has this student repeated any grades? Yes____No____Don't know_____
If yes, please circle the total number of times. 1 2 3 4 5 or more.

4. Does this student come from an unstable family situation (where serious marital or family conflict is evident)? Yes____No_____Don't Know_____

5. To your knowledge, does this student have a well-balanced diet?
Yes____No____Don't Know____

6. Circle the percentile below nearest to the student's percentile score on the Reading Readiness Test taken during the first grade.
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

7. To what extent does this child's parents participate in school activities?
_____(1) Not at all
_____(2) Occasionally
_____(3) Often

8. Characterize his or her general academic performance.
_____(1) Superior
_____(2) Above Average
_____(3) Average
_____(4) Below Average
_____(5) Poor

9. How much time does this child spend daily in school specifically on reading?
_____(1) Up to 1 hour
_____(2) 1 hour up to 1 1/2 hour
_____(3) More than 1 1/2 hours

District 22 Evaluation Continued

10. What is the size of this child's instructional group in reading?
_____(1) Individualized
_____(2) Small group (up to 10)
_____(3) Entire class

11. Primarily to what reading program has the student been exposed this academic year?
_____(1) Programmed instruction (like Distar)
_____(2) Basal reader
_____(3) Individualized program (like SRA)
_____(4) Individualized reading through classroom library books
_____(5) Other, please specify_____

12. Approximately how often has this student been absent from school this academic year?
_____(1) Seldom or never absent (missing 0-7 days)
_____(2) Occasionally absent (8 - 15 days)
_____(3) Often absent (16 - 30 days)
_____(4) Almost never in attendance

13. From what you know, how would you characterize this student's typical classroom conduct?
_____(1) Cooperative
_____(2) Indifferent
_____(3) Uncooperative

14. From your knowledge, what degree of psychological assistance does this student appear to require?
_____(1) Considerable
_____(2) Some
_____(3) None at all

15. To your knowledge, to what extent has this student participated in compensatory reading programs in the past, either in school or non-school programs?
_____(1) None
_____(2) Several
_____(3) Many

16. Father's Occupation
_____(1) Professional-Managerial
_____(2) Clerical-Sales
_____(3) Skilled Worker
_____(4) Semi-skilled Worker
_____(5) Unskilled Worker
_____(6) Unemployed
_____(7) No basis for judging
_____(8) Not present in the home

17. Mother's Occupation
_____(1) Professional-Managerial (Other than educational)
_____(2) Educational (Teacher)
_____(3) Educational (Paraprofessional)
_____(4) Secretarial-Clerical
_____(5) Factory Worker
_____(6) Domestic
_____(7) Homemaker
_____(8) No basis for judging
_____(9) Not present in the home